



# THE LIBERATOR

## No Union with Slaveholders.

BOSTON, JANUARY 4, 1850.

## ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

## MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Hughes continued: 'It was stated as a matter of reflection upon Mr. Riddle, as I thought, I know him well; and he is as high-minded and honorable a gentleman as lives in Massachusetts—pursuing his business in a laudable way. If he sells anything, he sells quadrupeds, not bipeds; and I am glad that his vocation is of that description—his auctioneering of that sort.'

The same Mr. Smith is the gentleman who had a street fight, and a bout at fistfights with a Washington editor in Pennsylvania Avenue, on Friday last. These things show his calibre. What claim such a man has to set himself up as a grand inquisitor, and insolently to domineer over Northern members, it is difficult to say.

But we are wasting too much ink on the redoubtable Mr. Smith. Our main purpose was to protest against the insolent and insulting tone and manner which many Southern representatives are accustomed to assume towards Northern members and the North, on the slightest provocation, and without any provocation at all. The occasion alluded to is but one among the smallest of the exhibitions of this propensity. It must be that the horrible crime of Mr. Banks, in their estimation, consisted, though in an infinitesimal degree, in poaching on their peculiar domain. 'Disunionism' is their distinctive thunder, and no Northern man must dare to appropriate it even in homeopathic doses. Southern Conventions can make it the star of every annual meeting. Southern demagogues can threaten it from every stump; and the South generally can wave the banner of disunity at will, but let the Northern orator make the most distant allusion to it, and there may be an escape from any conceivable tyranny or evils, or there will be hue and cry raised to hunt him from the face of the earth as a sinner beyond political redemption. And, strange to say, there are lightskippish presses and demagogues at the North, ready and eager not only to join in this hue and cry, but to magnify the offence and furnish materials for attack. Now, disunionism has never obtained any available foothold at the North—and the demagogues who endeavor to affix the taint upon Mr. Banks, or any other New England representative, know the insinuation to be false and groundless. Disunionism is a bugbear peculiarly Southern, and the taunt comes with a decided ill grace from those whose nauseating use of 'this Southern remedy on all occasions' is as silly as it is disgusting. It is quite time that the entire North should learn to feel that this insolent and domineering spirit will not cease until the North itself manifests sufficient respect to repute the tribe of doughfaces within its own limits, and to show a proper resentment for all invasions of its own rights and constitutional privileges.

Mr. Stewart, in explaining the reason why he had been voting for Mr. Richardson, said that his (Mr. R.'s) position, as well as Mr. Fuller's, had been explained distinctly and explicitly, but Mr. Banks's had not. He inquired of Mr. B. whether he ever said in a speech in Maine, 'Let the Union slide'?

Mr. Banks replied that in that speech he said there might be such a state of things in which he would consent to such a proposition. He had reference to future contingencies, such as the prostration of the gigantic power of the government to the support of a single institution, slavery. He was for the Union as it is, and would meet its enemies in a fair field. He was for the Union as the guaranty of the rights of the States, and the main prop of our government. He would have the Union stand on the records of history in the language of Washington, 'crowned with immortal fame.'

Mr. Smith, of Va.—I am not satisfied with the answer of the gentleman. Did you say, 'under certain circumstances,' you 'would let the Union slide'?

Mr. Banks—I have said all I desire to say.

Mr. Smith, of Va.—I wish it to be distinctly understood that those who sustain Mr. Banks are voting for him with the knowledge that in a certain contingency he would let the Union slide.

Mr. Grow said, I ask the gentleman, and every member who has been here for the last four years, whether such a declaration has not been repeated from time to time by some of those who are now voting for Mr. Richardson, namely, that they are willing to dismember the Union, and let it slide, in a certain contingency. We stand here to support the compromise of the constitution as it is maintained by the fathers of the republic and contemporaneous reports for over sixty years. We say we are not willing to take any other construction, or to consent that slavery shall go wherever our flag floats.

Mr. Rust said he believed from the beginning that all debate was out of order, as the first business before the House was the election of a speaker.

Mr. Stewart submitted a proposition declaratory of the national principles on which the speaker of the House should stand.

Mr. Colfax stated that if Mr. Stewart would accept as a substitute a proposition for the annexation of Cuba, and appropriating by annexation of that part of Oregon surrendered to Great Britain by Mr. Polk, he might vote with that gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. Boocock raised a question of order, saying the law required that a speaker be elected, and members be sworn in, before the transaction of other business.

Mr. Boyce, among other questions, asked Mr. Banks as follows:—Are you in favor of recognizing Hayti, and receiving a black minister? Do you favor the abrogation of the Fugitive Slave Law, and the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia? [Cries from the friends of Mr. Banks, 'call the roll.'—*Laughter.*]

Mr. Banks replied to Mr. Boyce, and said he distinctly recollects Mr. Richardson being a candidate for speaker, declining to give answers to questions proposed to him. [Laughter:] cries of 'good god—call the roll.' [etc.]

Mr. Florene here made an ineffectual attempt to have the House adjourn until Thursday, for the purpose, as he said, that members might participate in the religious and social observances of Christmas. [Laughter.]

Mr. Brooks said he was willing to let the Union slide. If the gentlemen on the other side who support Mr. Banks have that fixed determination, he wanted his constituents to know it. He desired the issue made here, that it might be frankly met, if necessary.

Mr. Shorter, although voting for Mr. Richardson, was willing to unite on some other conservative candidate who believes that the Missouri line should not be restored, in order to effect an election.

The House then voted, with the following result: Banks 101, Richardson 72, Fuller 31, Pennington 4, scattering 7; necessary to a choice, 108.

Mr. Nichols offered a resolution, that a speaker be elected by a plurality vote. Tabled by 116 against 101.

Mr. Orr moved that when the House adjourn, it be till Thursday.

Mr. Giddings—We have no power to adjourn; if the motion were agreed to, a majority may come here to-morrow, reverse the order, and elect a speaker.

Mr. Florene—And it would be a very pretty example for Christian men to set the country. [Merriment.]

Mr. Orr's motion was then negatived, and the House adjourned until Wednesday.

From the Salem Register.

## OVERSEERISM IN CONGRESS.

Our readers will find, in the Congressional record, a small specimen of that insolent overruling which some of the Southern members of Congress are so constantly attempting to exercise over Northern men, that it has become a staple commodity with that class of fire-eaters devoted to the Slave Power. We refer to the inquisitorial process which one William Smith, of Virginia, undertook to institute over Mr. Banks, of Massachusetts, on Monday last, in regard to the awful crime of having said in a speech in Maine, last fall, something to this effect, viz.—that, if ever the gigantic power of this government should be prostituted chiefly to the propagation of human slavery, he would be willing to let the Union slide! And for uttering this sentiment, the representative of the Virginian branch of the multitudinous Smith family was inclined to hold up Mr. Banks, by his mien, to the constituents south of Mason & Dixon's, as some mysterious monster, for whom it was rank treason to vote—though how and why the sentiment was so atrocious does not appear. Mr. Banks made a very proper reply to the self-appointed overseer, but the great Mr. Smith pompously declared that he was not satisfied with the answer, as though he were the *Sic Oratio* from whose dictum there could be no appeal.

Now who is this Mr. Smith, that he assumes to be a political lord of the lash, and to flourish his whip over the heads of Northern Representatives?

Why, he is neither more nor less than the famous man contractor, who, some years ago, was the subject of 'Extra Billy'—the frequency with which 'extra' charges made their appearance in the settlement of his accounts. An amusing reference to this circumstance, and to the Virginian's peculiar propensities, was made during a debate at the first session of the last Congress. While the appropriation bill was up, and the clause providing for the payment of Mr. Edward Riddle, of Boston, for his services in the Crystal Palace Exhibition, was before the House, this Smith spoke smugly and contemptuously of Mr. Riddle as 'a horse dealer and auctioneer in the city of Boston.' Mr. Hughes, of New York, in reply, remarked: 'It was said by the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. Smith], that Mr. Riddle is a gentleman whom I know very well—was a horse dealer and auctioneer in Massachusetts. I ask if it is worse to be a horse dealer in Massachusetts, than to run a line of stage coaches in Virginia, or any other State, whether it be a regular or extra line of coaches?' Mr. Smith then declared my intention to reflect upon Mr. Riddle, and Mr.

Hughes continued: 'It was stated as a matter of reflection upon Mr. Riddle, as I thought, I know him well; and he is as high-minded and honorable a gentleman as lives in Massachusetts—pursuing his business in a laudable way. If he sells anything, he sells quadrupeds, not bipeds; and I am glad that his vocation is of that description—his auctioneering of that sort.'

The same Mr. Smith is the gentleman who had a street fight, and a bout at fistfights with a Washington editor in Pennsylvania Avenue, on Friday last. These things show his calibre. What claim such a man has to set himself up as a grand inquisitor, and insolently to domineer over Northern members, it is difficult to say.

But we are wasting too much ink on the redoubtable Mr. Smith. Our main purpose was to protest against the insolent and insulting tone and manner which many Southern representatives are accustomed to assume towards Northern members and the North, on the slightest provocation, and without any provocation at all. The occasion alluded to is but one among the smallest of the exhibitions of this propensity. It must be that the horrible crime of Mr. Banks, in their estimation, consisted, though in an infinitesimal degree, in poaching on their peculiar domain. 'Disunionism' is their distinctive thunder, and no Northern man must dare to appropriate it even in homeopathic doses. Southern Conventions can make it the star of every annual meeting. Southern demagogues can threaten it from every stump; and the South generally can wave the banner of disunity at will, but let the Northern orator make the most distant allusion to it, and there may be an escape from any conceivable tyranny or evils, or there will be hue and cry raised to hunt him from the face of the earth as a sinner beyond political redemption. And, strange to say, there are lightskippish presses and demagogues at the North, ready and eager not only to join in this hue and cry, but to magnify the offence and furnish materials for attack. Now, disunionism has never obtained any available foothold at the North—and the demagogues who endeavor to affix the taint upon Mr. Banks, or any other New England representative, know the insinuation to be false and groundless. Disunionism is a bugbear peculiarly Southern, and the taunt comes with a decided ill grace from those whose nauseating use of 'this Southern remedy on all occasions' is as silly as it is disgusting. It is quite time that the entire North should learn to feel that this insolent and domineering spirit will not cease until the North itself manifests sufficient respect to repute the tribe of doughfaces within its own limits, and to show a proper resentment for all invasions of its own rights and constitutional privileges.

Mr. Stewart, in explaining the reason why he had been voting for Mr. Richardson, said that his (Mr. R.'s) position, as well as Mr. Fuller's, had been explained distinctly and explicitly, but Mr. Banks's had not. He inquired of Mr. B. whether he ever said in a speech in Maine, 'Let the Union slide'?

Mr. Banks replied that in that speech he said there might be such a state of things in which he would consent to such a proposition. He had reference to future contingencies, such as the prostration of the gigantic power of the government to the support of a single institution, slavery. He was for the Union as it is, and would meet its enemies in a fair field. He was for the Union as the guaranty of the rights of the States, and the main prop of our government. He would have the Union stand on the records of history in the language of Washington, 'crowned with immortal fame.'

Mr. Smith, of Va.—I am not satisfied with the answer of the gentleman. Did you say, 'under certain circumstances,' you 'would let the Union slide'?

Mr. Banks—I have said all I desire to say.

Mr. Smith, of Va.—I wish it to be distinctly understood that those who sustain Mr. Banks are voting for him with the knowledge that in a certain contingency he would let the Union slide.

Mr. Grow said, I ask the gentleman, and every member who has been here for the last four years, whether such a declaration has not been repeated from time to time by some of those who are now voting for Mr. Richardson, namely, that they are willing to dismember the Union, and let it slide, in a certain contingency. We stand here to support the compromise of the constitution as it is maintained by the fathers of the republic and contemporaneous reports for over sixty years. We say we are not willing to take any other construction, or to consent that slavery shall go wherever our flag floats.

Mr. Rust said he believed from the beginning that all debate was out of order, as the first business before the House was the election of a speaker.

Mr. Stewart submitted a proposition declaratory of the national principles on which the speaker of the House should stand.

Mr. Colfax stated that if Mr. Stewart would accept as a substitute a proposition for the annexation of Cuba, and appropriating by annexation of that part of Oregon surrendered to Great Britain by Mr. Polk, he might vote with that gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. Boyce raised a question of order, saying the law required that a speaker be elected, and members be sworn in, before the transaction of other business.

Mr. Smith, of Va.—I wish it to be distinctly understood that those who sustain Mr. Banks are voting for him with the knowledge that in a certain contingency he would let the Union slide.

Mr. Grow said, I ask the gentleman, and every member who has been here for the last four years, whether such a declaration has not been repeated from time to time by some of those who are now voting for Mr. Richardson, namely, that they are willing to dismember the Union, and let it slide, in a certain contingency. We stand here to support the compromise of the constitution as it is maintained by the fathers of the republic and contemporaneous reports for over sixty years. We say we are not willing to take any other construction, or to consent that slavery shall go wherever our flag floats.

Mr. Rust said he believed from the beginning that all debate was out of order, as the first business before the House was the election of a speaker.

Mr. Stewart submitted a proposition declaratory of the national principles on which the speaker of the House should stand.

Mr. Colfax stated that if Mr. Stewart would accept as a substitute a proposition for the annexation of Cuba, and appropriating by annexation of that part of Oregon surrendered to Great Britain by Mr. Polk, he might vote with that gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. Boyce raised a question of order, saying the law required that a speaker be elected, and members be sworn in, before the transaction of other business.

Mr. Smith, of Va.—I wish it to be distinctly understood that those who sustain Mr. Banks are voting for him with the knowledge that in a certain contingency he would let the Union slide.

Mr. Grow said, I ask the gentleman, and every member who has been here for the last four years, whether such a declaration has not been repeated from time to time by some of those who are now voting for Mr. Richardson, namely, that they are willing to dismember the Union, and let it slide, in a certain contingency. We stand here to support the compromise of the constitution as it is maintained by the fathers of the republic and contemporaneous reports for over sixty years. We say we are not willing to take any other construction, or to consent that slavery shall go wherever our flag floats.

Mr. Rust said he believed from the beginning that all debate was out of order, as the first business before the House was the election of a speaker.

Mr. Stewart submitted a proposition declaratory of the national principles on which the speaker of the House should stand.

Mr. Colfax stated that if Mr. Stewart would accept as a substitute a proposition for the annexation of Cuba, and appropriating by annexation of that part of Oregon surrendered to Great Britain by Mr. Polk, he might vote with that gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. Boyce raised a question of order, saying the law required that a speaker be elected, and members be sworn in, before the transaction of other business.

Mr. Smith, of Va.—I wish it to be distinctly understood that those who sustain Mr. Banks are voting for him with the knowledge that in a certain contingency he would let the Union slide.

Mr. Grow said, I ask the gentleman, and every member who has been here for the last four years, whether such a declaration has not been repeated from time to time by some of those who are now voting for Mr. Richardson, namely, that they are willing to dismember the Union, and let it slide, in a certain contingency. We stand here to support the compromise of the constitution as it is maintained by the fathers of the republic and contemporaneous reports for over sixty years. We say we are not willing to take any other construction, or to consent that slavery shall go wherever our flag floats.

Mr. Rust said he believed from the beginning that all debate was out of order, as the first business before the House was the election of a speaker.

Mr. Stewart submitted a proposition declaratory of the national principles on which the speaker of the House should stand.

Mr. Colfax stated that if Mr. Stewart would accept as a substitute a proposition for the annexation of Cuba, and appropriating by annexation of that part of Oregon surrendered to Great Britain by Mr. Polk, he might vote with that gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. Boyce raised a question of order, saying the law required that a speaker be elected, and members be sworn in, before the transaction of other business.

Mr. Smith, of Va.—I wish it to be distinctly understood that those who sustain Mr. Banks are voting for him with the knowledge that in a certain contingency he would let the Union slide.

Mr. Grow said, I ask the gentleman, and every member who has been here for the last four years, whether such a declaration has not been repeated from time to time by some of those who are now voting for Mr. Richardson, namely, that they are willing to dismember the Union, and let it slide, in a certain contingency. We stand here to support the compromise of the constitution as it is maintained by the fathers of the republic and contemporaneous reports for over sixty years. We say we are not willing to take any other construction, or to consent that slavery shall go wherever our flag floats.

Mr. Rust said he believed from the beginning that all debate was out of order, as the first business before the House was the election of a speaker.

Mr. Stewart submitted a proposition declaratory of the national principles on which the speaker of the House should stand.

Mr. Colfax stated that if Mr. Stewart would accept as a substitute a proposition for the annexation of Cuba, and appropriating by annexation of that part of Oregon surrendered to Great Britain by Mr. Polk, he might vote with that gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. Boyce raised a question of order, saying the law required that a speaker be elected, and members be sworn in, before the transaction of other business.

Mr. Smith, of Va.—I wish it to be distinctly understood that those who sustain Mr. Banks are voting for him with the knowledge that in a certain contingency he would let the Union slide.

Mr. Grow said, I ask the gentleman, and every member who has been here for the last four years, whether such a declaration has not been repeated from time to time by some of those who are now voting for Mr. Richardson, namely, that they are willing to dismember the Union, and let it slide, in a certain contingency. We stand here to support the compromise of the constitution as it is maintained by the fathers of the republic and contemporaneous reports for over sixty years. We say we are not willing to take any other construction, or to consent that slavery shall go wherever our flag floats.

Mr. Rust said he believed from the beginning that all debate was out of order, as the first business before the House was the election of a speaker.

Mr. Stewart submitted a proposition declaratory of the national principles on which the speaker of the House should stand.

Mr. Colfax stated that if Mr. Stewart would accept as a substitute a proposition for the annexation of Cuba, and appropriating by annexation of that part of Oregon surrendered to Great Britain by Mr. Polk, he might vote with that gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. Boyce raised a question of order, saying the law required that a speaker be elected, and members be sworn in, before the transaction of other business.

Mr. Smith, of Va.—I wish it to be distinctly understood that those who sustain Mr. Banks are voting for him with the knowledge that in a certain contingency he would let the Union slide.

Mr. Grow said, I ask the gentleman, and every member who has been here for the last four years, whether such a declaration has not been repeated from time to time by some of those who are now voting for Mr. Richardson, namely, that they are willing to dismember the Union, and let it slide, in a certain contingency. We stand here to support the compromise of the constitution as it is maintained by the fathers of the republic and contemporaneous reports for over sixty years. We say we are not willing to take any other construction, or to consent that slavery shall go wherever our flag floats.



## POETRY.

From the Liberty Bell for 1855.

## A CURSE FOR A NATION.

BY ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING.

## PROLOGUE.

I heard an angel speak last night,  
And he said, 'Write!  
Write a nation's curse for me,  
And send it over the western sea.'  
I faltered, taking up the word—  
'Not so, my lord!  
If curses must be, choose another  
To send the curse against my brother;  
For I am bound by gratitude,  
In love and blood.  
To brothers of mine across the sea,  
Who have stretched out kindly hands to me.'  
'Therefore,' the voice said, 'shalt thou write  
My curse to-night!  
From the summits of love a curse is driven,  
As lightning from the tops of heaven.'

'Not so!' I answered. 'Evermore  
My heart is sore  
For my own land's sins! for the little feet  
Of children bleeding along the street.  
For such-up honors, that gainsay  
The right of way!

For almsgiving through a door that is  
Not open enough for two friends to kiss.  
For an oligarchic parliament,  
And classes rent.

What curse to another land assign,  
When heavy-souled for the sins of mine?

'Therefore,' the voice said, 'shalt thou write  
My curse to-night!

Because thou hast strength to see and hate  
An ill thing done within thy gate.'

'Not so!' I answered, once again—  
'To curse, choose men;

For I, a woman, have only known  
How the heart melts, and the tears run down.'

'Therefore,' the voice said, 'shalt thou write  
My curse to-night!

There are women who weep and curse, I say,  
(And no one marvels,) night and day.

'And thou shalt take their part to-night—  
Weep and write!

A curse from the depths of womanhood  
Is very salt, and bitter, and good.'

So thus I wrote, and mourned indeed,  
What all may read;

And thus, as was enjoined on me,  
I send it over the western sea.

## THE CURSE.

I.

Because ye break brokes your own chain  
With the strain

Of brave men climbing a nation's height,  
Yet thence bear down with chain and thong  
On the souls of others,—for this wrong

This is the curse—write!

Because ye prosper in God's name,  
With a claim

To honor in the whole world's sight,  
Do the feed's work perfectly  
On babes and women—for this lie

This is the curse—write!

II.

You shall watch while kings conspire  
Bound the people's smouldering fire,

And, warn for your part,

Shall never dare—O shame!  
To utter the thought into flame  
Which burns at your heart.

This is the curse—write!

You shall watch while nations strive  
With the bloodhounds,—die or survive,—

Drop faint from their jaws,

Or throttle them backward to death,  
And only under your breath  
Shall ye bless the cause.

This is the curse—write!

III.

You shall watch while strong men draw \*

The nets of feudal law

To strangle the weak;

Ye shall count the sin for a sin,

But your soul shall be sadder within

Than the word which ye speak.

This is the curse—write!

You shall watch while rich men dine,  
And poor men hunger and pine

For one cruse in seven;

But shall quaff from the signs which present  
God's judgment as imminent

To make it all even.

This is the curse—write!

When good men are praying erect  
That Christ may avenge his elect,

And deliver the earth,

The prayer in your ears, said low,  
Shall sound like the tramp of a foe

That's driving you forth.

This is the curse—write!

When wise men give you their praise,  
They shall pause in the heat of the phrase,

And sickle afar;

When ye boast your own charters kept true,  
You shall blush!—for the thing which ye do

Derides what ye are.

This is the curse—write!

When fools write taunts on your gate,  
Your scorn ye shall somewhat abate,

As ye look o'er the wall;

For your conscience, tradition, and name,  
Strike back with a deadlier blane

Than the worst of them.

This is the curse—write!

Go! while ill deeds shall be done,  
Plant on your flag in the sun

Beside the ill-doers:

And shrink from clenching the curse  
Of the witnessing universe,

With a curse of yours!

This is the curse—write!

FLORENCE, Italy.

## INVOCATION.

The following exquisite utterance is from the heart of Mrs. Elizabeth Barrett Browning:

Speak low to me, my Savior, low and sweet  
From out the hallelujahs, sweet and low,  
Lest I should fear and fall, and miss thee so,  
Who are not missed by any that entreat.  
Speak to me as to Mary at thy feet—  
And if no precious gems my hand bestow,  
Let my tears drop like amber, while I go  
In reach of thy divinest voice, complete  
In humanest affection—thus, in sooth,  
To lose the sense of losing! As a child,  
Whose song-bird seeks the wood for emvers,  
Is sung to, in its stead, by mother's mouth,  
Till sinking on her breast, love reconciled,  
He sleeps the faster that he wept before.

## THE LIBERATOR.

## LETTER TO PARKER PILLSBURY.

FRAMINGHAM, Mass., U. S. A. }  
Dec. 23d, 1855. }

FRIEND PARKER PILLSBURY:

I have been often inclined to send you a few lines, when a newspaper came from you to tell us that we were remembered among your numerous anti-slavery friends. But, knowing how many other and more interesting correspondents you had, I forbore to burden you; therefore have sometimes turned the current of remembrance and regard, from across the ocean, to the intervals of the Merrimac, where dwelt those dear to your heart, and so serve you by cheering them. None know or appreciate more fully the heroic self-denial of your Sarah, and what a gift she has laid on the altar of Freedom. We know her affectionate nature, her love of home, and the quiet joys that cluster there; her delicate organization, too slight to bear, unharmed, the burden of domestic cares and duties alone; her deep conjugal love, so tried by your long absence and severe sickness, the nurture of your loved Nellie, and the thousand little cares which buzz round daily life. When the historian of the anti-slavery movement makes up his jewels for the grand coronation of Liberty, hope will not forget these heroines of the fireside and home. Woman will then be more justly priz'd and honored.

I rejoice exceedingly at the work you are doing in Great Britain—perhaps the most difficult to be done there, for it is always hard to sever sectarian bonds and religious ties. It may earn more kicks than kind words; but you are used to that, and it is the greatest importance that the great religious bodies there should know how dead and cumbersome the churches are here. I have a few facts, which have come under my own observation, which will illustrate how this worse indifference to slavery invests the more minute and distant religious organizations.

I live in a town of about four thousand inhabitants. In the Centre Village, there are three churches—Orthodox (Congregational), Unitarian (Congregational), and Baptist. I wish to speak of these three particularly. (In Saxonville and South Framingham, there are one Methodist, Catholic, Orthodox, Baptist and Universalist.) The Orthodox minister, in the Centre, (a native of New Hampshire) is Rev. J. C. Bodwell, who was a dissenting preacher in England for fourteen years, and married an English woman. Neither of them takes any interest in the anti-slavery cause. A year or two since, a colored woman called there, in Mr. B.'s absence, to procure assistance to buy her children out of bondage. Mrs. B. sent her away with the words—I know nothing about slavery, and my husband is away. I have never heard of his preaching an anti-slavery sermon. One who has attended his church for several years, asked lately what anti-slavery was—not knowing even that. Last Thanksgiving Day, he preached a sermon on obedience to the powers that be, and inculcated the doctrine of obeying the laws, no matter how wicked they might be. This I had from one of his own people. Of course, this is teaching obedience to the *Fugitive Slave Law as a Christian duty*. Last winter, I obtained the signatures of a few citizens to a paper requesting the ministers of the town to deliver a course of anti-slavery lectures. We called on Mr. Bodwell with the request. He acceded to it cheerfully; said he should like an opportunity of jutting down a few thoughts on the subject! Had he never done so? We asked him to deliver the first soon. Now—he had nothing on hand! The other two ministers also acceded, as did those in the other parts of the town, (except Catholic and Methodist, we never heard from them.) After waiting a week or so, these 'divines' concluded, as it was rather late in the season, and there had been a course in Boston, and so on, that it would be better to postpone till the next autumn, when they could prepare themselves thoroughly, and have a more effective course. The signers urged immediate action, but the ministers decided to postpone. That was the last we ever heard of. 'Next autumn' has come and gone, and not the faintest whisper from them on the subject. It seems to have gone into the grave with that abortive conception of a Ministerial Convention during the week Burns was kidnapped in Boston.

On the 1st of August, 1852, there was a celebration of West India Emancipation at Harmony Grove, in South Framingham. A general invitation was extended to all persons. With my own hands I carried a notice of the same to Mr. Bodwell, with the remark that, as he had lived in England, he might be interested in the celebration of one of the most important events in English history. He made no reply indicating a desire to go, or regard for the occasion. He was not at the meeting. He has never attended an anti-slavery meeting in this town for the last five years; not even in person, I think, certainly not as a participant, and in the prominent position, his profession demands. The same is true of the other ministers in town. Not one has ever been present at any meeting of the agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society in this place since my residence here, five years.

You inquire if it is irrevocably fixed that Mrs. Rose is to appear in the Anti-Slavery Course? Why should she not? You urge as a reason for breaking our engagement with her, her published letter (the one, I suppose, that appeared in the *Mercy of the 5th inst.*) behind and beyond which you do not wish to go? By that, we learn that she has presided once at a Paine Celebration, and twice made speeches on such an occasion, the purpose of which you do not know.

The people of England cannot understand this as we do who live in the midst of it, with all our sympathies alive to the least infidelity to the rights of the millions in bondage. Let them read these details. Let them never be weary of appealing to the American churches. Let their cry be—Repent ye! repent ye!

I was particular and personal, moreover, in order to meet with unequivocal facts the continual outcry against the Abolitionists—You abuse the ministers and churches, and puress the miserable blacks who infamously and wantonly slander her. Mr. Battles has published in the *Banger Daily Journal* the following reply to a *Rev. D. B. Little*, whose name, it will be seen, is significant of his nature! The reply of Mr. Battles will be found to be a liberal, generous, and manly vindication of an estimable and much-injured lady; and every person, whose opinion is worth anything, will heartily commend Mr. B. for the honorable part he has acted in this contest of liberality against bigotry.—*Boston Investigator.*

the willing tool of the Slave Oligarchy; in the Church, of the age, lecture upon Eastern Travel, because she discarded the doctrine of immortality! Will you close the lecture-room to Professor Agassiz, because he maintains opinions which, many think, undermine the first chapter of Genesis?

During the revolutionary war, Thomas Paine offered upon the altar of freedom his talents and pen. Infidel though he was, the Christian patriots of that day did not disdain the offering. They were all engaged in a common cause—the cause of human liberty—and they welcomed the labors of any who had a heart to work. History mentions with pride the aid Paine rendered to the revolutionary struggle, and the Legislature of Pennsylvania voted him twenty-five hundred dollars for his pamphlet on 'Common Sense.'

To-day, more than three millions of us follow men, suffering more than a bondage, 'hour long of which nothing in misery,' and use the language of Mr. Jefferson, 'a century of that against which our fathers rose in rebellion,' and not only are they suffering, but the tyrannical power which forged their chains, has laid its bloody hand on us, and scissored the land with oppression, and a pure-minded, self-sacrificing woman—like Paine, of foreign parentage,—offers her talents and voice to help strike off the shackles; and shall we be less catholic than our revolutionary fathers, and say to her, because she has presided at a Paine festival, and sympathizes with Paine's religious sentiments, that we want none of your help? Would the slave thus speak? I submit that such a procedure is to allow our bigotry to rule humanity, and to govern our sense of justice. If your house were on fire, and an atheist should offer to carry a pail of water, could you spurn his kindness, because your religious opinions might receive a 'violent shock' to your house saved by heretical hands?

Reference is made, in your note, to the 'religious sensibilities of a large and respectable portion of this community.' For the virtue of this class, in the private walks of life, I trust I am not wanting in respect. But to their wishes, in a matter of this kind, I pay but little deference. I fear they allow their prejudices and sectarianism to rule their aspirations. But do not women now wear right clothes? It is a new doctrine, that high and holy purposes go from without inward—to the persons of men and women, and govern and control their aspirations. But do not women labor right earnestly? Do not the German women, of our market women, labor right earnestly? Do not the wives of our farmers and mechanics toil? Is not the work of the mothers in our land as important as that of the fathers? 'Labor is the foundation of wealth.' The reason that our women are 'nurses' is not that they do not 'labor right earnestly,' but that the law gives their earnings into the hands of mankind. Mr. Smith says, 'That women are helpless is no wonder, so long as they are parasites.' He might add, no wonder that the slaves of the cotton plantation are helpless, so long as they are paupers. What reduces both the woman and the slave to this condition? The law which gives the husband and the master entire control of the person and earnings of each; the law which makes each of the rights and liberties that every 'free white male citizen' has to himself, go from him to his master.

If a woman, who is called 'infidel,' proposes to speak *herself* upon the same American slavery, she is denounced and vilified. But a clergyman who advocates the infamous and infidel Fugitive Slave Law, is freely admitted into a Bangor pulpit; and if Dr. Adams or Dr. Lord, who have alike disgraced the name of Christianity and dishonored themselves, should visit us, I suppose they would be welcomed by the same class to whom the cotton plantation slaves are helpless, so long as they are paupers.

I am not defending the atheistic opinions of Mrs. Rose. I have no sympathy for them; but I do not yet think so meanly of many just as to believe it will yield simply to a change of garments. Let us assert our right to be free. Let us own ourselves, our city, to advocate a scheme next in intimacy to slavery itself—since it denies the manhood of the colored race, and convives with the slaveholder,—our best pulpiteers are thrown wide open to him, and his notices are given in a loud voice.

I am not conceding to her rights of property, or the express right to be a mother. Let us own ourselves, our earnings, our genius; let us have power to control, as well as to earn and to own; then will each woman adjust her dress to her relations in life. Mr. Smith speaks of the Reforms of *Julius Caesar*; I am not yet thinking of *Julius Caesar*.

I am not defending the atheistic opinions of Mrs. Rose. I have no sympathy for them; but I do not yet think so meanly of many just as to believe it will yield simply to a change of garments. Let us assert our right to be free. Let us own ourselves, our city, to advocate a scheme next in intimacy to slavery itself—since it denies the manhood of the colored race, and convives with the slaveholder,—our best pulpiteers are thrown wide open to him, and his notices are given in a loud voice.

I am not conceding to her rights of property, or the express right to be a mother. Let us own ourselves, our earnings, our genius; let us have power to control, as well as to earn and to own; then will each woman adjust her dress to her relations in life. Mr. Smith speaks of the Reforms of *Julius Caesar*; I am not yet thinking of *Julius Caesar*.

I am not defending the atheistic opinions of Mrs. Rose. I have no sympathy for them; but I do not yet think so meanly of many just as to believe it will yield simply to a change of garments. Let us assert our right to be free. Let us own ourselves, our city, to advocate a scheme next in intimacy to slavery itself—since it denies the manhood of the colored race, and convives with the slaveholder,—our best pulpiteers are thrown wide open to him, and his notices are given in a loud voice.

I am not conceding to her rights of property, or the express right to be a mother. Let us own ourselves, our earnings, our genius; let us have power to control, as well as to earn and to own; then will each woman adjust her dress to her relations in life. Mr. Smith speaks of the Reforms of *Julius Caesar*; I am not yet thinking of *Julius Caesar*.

I am not conceding to her rights of property, or the express right to be a mother. Let us own ourselves, our earnings, our genius; let us have power to control, as well as to earn and to own; then will each woman adjust her dress to her relations in life. Mr. Smith speaks of the Reforms of *Julius Caesar*; I am not yet thinking of *Julius Caesar*.

I am not conceding to her rights of property, or the express right to be a mother. Let us own ourselves, our earnings, our genius; let us have power to control, as well as to earn and to own; then will each woman adjust her dress to her relations in life. Mr. Smith speaks of the Reforms of *Julius Caesar*; I am not yet thinking of *Julius Caesar*.

I am not conceding to her rights of property, or the express right to be a mother. Let us own ourselves, our earnings, our genius; let us have power to control, as well as to earn and to own; then will each woman adjust her dress to her relations in life. Mr. Smith speaks of the Reforms of *Julius Caesar*; I am not yet thinking of *Julius Caesar*.

I am not conceding